



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,851	11/14/2005	Klaus Rock	R & K-6090	6187
24131	7590	09/19/2007	EXAMINER	
LERNER GREENBERG STEMER LLP			TANG, KAREN C	
P O BOX 2480			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
HOLLYWOOD, FL 33022-2480			2151	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/551,851	ROCK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Karen C. Tang	2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 22-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 22-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/21/05</u> | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. Claims 22-42 are presented for examination.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant must defines what the abbreviation "RDP" is stand for.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The limitation of the language "essentially without" is not clear due to the meaning of the term cannot depend on the unrestrained, subject opinion of the person practicing the invention

Art Unit: 2151

and does not distinctly define the metes and bounds of the subject matters. Therefore, for the examining purpose, the limitation will not have any patentable weight.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 22-35, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hals et al hereinafter Hals (US 6,920,505) in view of Ahern (US 6,966,029) and further view of Hind et al hereinafter Hind (US 7,194,683).

2. Referring to Claims 22 and 37, Hal discloses a method for reducing the latency time for interactive data communication between a server computer and a client computer via a telecommunication network, in particular via a satellite network comprising: a geostationary satellite (the system utilizes satellite link in order to determine the necessary information, refer to Col 5, Lines 60-65 and Col 7, Lines 35-46), wherein a data processing application, in particular a database application, run on the server and generates screen displays of an interactive user application with several data fields that are processed one after the other in a processing sequence in line with predetermined parameters based on commands and data entered (the server has a database application/search engine that has several data fields, refer to Col 8, Lines 15-22. Visitor/user enters the comment/search term, and the search engine will

process everything accordingly, refer to Col 8, Lines 30-50) via an input medium (keyboard, refer to Col 14, Lines 6) connected to the client computer and are then transferred to the client computer in the form of data packets (refer to Col 7, Lines 50-60) and display by this client computer on a display medium, whereby on the display medium a command prompt signalizes that additional data is to be entered in a corresponding data field via the input medium (refer to Col 7, Lines 50-60), and then transmitted in the form of additional data packets via the telecommunication network to the server computer, wherein the parameters for the processing sequence of the data field are transferred via the telecommunication network to the client computer (refer to Col 7, Lines 20-60 and), and an independent program routine runs on the client computer which alters the screen display independently in such a way when entering specified commands via the input medium based on the parameters for the processing sequence (once the user enter the search parameter in the web page, and press “sent”, once the server receive the request, server then sent the requesting data/new web page back to the user, refer to Col 13, Lines 23-45).

Although Hals disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Hals is silent regarding “the input prompt within the data field is moved to the next or previous data field in line with the processing sequence”

Ahern, in an analogous art disclosed, “the input prompt within the data field is moved to the next or previous data field in line with the processing sequence.” (refer to Col 3, Lines 14-30) Hence, providing features disclosed by Ahern, would be desirable for a user to implement because Hals indicates there are numerous modification and change may be made to the system without departing from the teaching of Hals.

Art Unit: 2151

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hals by including the features that prevent errors while display the information on the web page.

Although Hals and Ahern disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Hals and Ahern are silent regarding “receive data without acknowledgement of receipt”

Hind, in an analogous art disclosed, “receive data without acknowledgement of receipt” (refer to Col 5, Lines 50-60)

Hence, providing features disclosed by Hind, would be desirable for a user to implement because Hals indicates there are numerous modification and change may be made to the system without departing from the teaching of Hals.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hals and Ahern by including the features that improve the web document presentation and provide easier approach to edit data content.

3. Referring to Claim 23, Hals discloses a method according to claim 22, wherein the server computer is operated using a window-based operating system, whereby the screen displays transmitted to the client computer are generated on the server computer using a window program routine of the operating system on the server computer based on window and object parameters prior to being sent to the client computer (Hals indicates the uses of Microsoft Internet Explore, which is inherent the use of window-based operating system, refer to Col 17, Lines 1-25).

Art Unit: 2151

4. Referring to Claim 24, Hals discloses a method according to claim 23, wherein the independent program routine receives the parameters for the processing sequence of the data fields by accessing the window program routine of the operating system on the server computer (server is also a window based operating system, refer to Col 17, Lines 1-25).

5. Referring to Claim 25, although Hals disclosed the invention substantially as claimed according to claim 23, Hals is silent regarding, "wherein the independent program routines receives a copy or partial copy of the window and object parameters which the window program routine of the operating system on the server computer uses to generate the active screen display".

Although Hals disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Hals is silent regarding "the input prompt within the data field is moved to the next or previous data field in line with the processing sequence".

Ahern, in an analogous art disclosed, "the input prompt within the data field is moved to the next or previous data field in line with the processing sequence" (refer to Col 3, Lines 14-30).

Hence, providing features disclosed by Ahern, would be desirable for a user to implement because Hals indicates there are numerous modification and change may be made to the system without departing from the teaching of Hals.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hals by including the features that prevent errors while display the information on the web page.

Art Unit: 2151

6. Referring to Claim 26, although Hals disclosed the invention substantially as claimed according to claim 22, Hals is silent regarding, discloses a method according to claim 22, "wherein the independent program routine additionally receives the type and/or style and/or size of the font used in a data field alongside the parameters for the processing sequences of the data field."

Ahern, in an analogous art disclosed, "wherein the independent program routine additionally receives the type and/or style and/or size of the font used in a data field alongside the parameters for the processing sequences of the data field." (refer to Col 4, Lines 27).

Hence, providing features disclosed by Ahern, would be desirable for a user to implement because Hals indicates there are numerous modification and change may be made to the system without departing from the teaching of Hals.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hals by including the features that prevent errors while display the information on the web page.

7. Referring to Claim 27, Hals discloses a method according to claim 23, "wherein the independent program routine receives the parameters for the processing sequence of the data fields and/or the window and object parameters from an additional program routine running on the server program" (refer to Col 7, Lines 20-45).

8. Referring to Claim 28, although Hals disclosed the invention substantially as claimed according to claim 23, Hals is silent regarding " wherein the independent program routine

analyzes the commands and/or data entered via the input medium before sending these to the server computer and independently alters the active screen display based on the processing sequence and window and object parameters”.

Ahern, in an analogous art disclosed, “wherein the independent program routine analyzes the commands and/or data entered via the input medium before sending these to the server computer and independently alters the active screen display based on the processing sequence and window and object parameters” (refer to Col 4, Lines 30-66).

Hence, providing features disclosed by Ahern, would be desirable for a user to implement because Hals indicates there are numerous modification and change may be made to the system without departing from the teaching of Hals.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hals by including the features that prevent errors while display the information on the web page.

9. Referring to Claim 29, although Hals disclosed the invention substantially as claimed according to claim 28, Hals is silent regarding “wherein the independent program routine independently alters the active screen display based on the processing sequence as well as the window and object parameters in such a way that the input prompt is moved to the start of the previous data field when a specified command occurs which is assigned to a backward jump to a previous.”

Ahern, in an analogous art disclosed, “wherein the independent program routine independently alters the active screen display based on the processing sequence as well as the window and

object parameters in such a way that the input prompt is moved to the start of the previous data field when a specified command occurs which is assigned to a backward jump to a previous.” (refer to Col 7, Lines 20-45).

Hence, providing features disclosed by Ahern, would be desirable for a user to implement because Hals indicates there are numerous modification and change may be made to the system without departing from the teaching of Hals.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hals by including the features that prevent errors while display the information on the web page.

10. Referring to Claim 30, although Hals disclosed the invention substantially as claimed according to claim 28, Hals is silent regarding “wherein the independent program routine independently alters the active screen display based on the processing sequence as well as the window and object parameters in such a way that the input prompt is moved to the start of the next data field when a specified command occurs which is assigned to a forward jump to a previous data field.”

Ahern, in an analogous art disclosed, “wherein the independent program routine independently alters the active screen display based on the processing sequence as well as the window and object parameters in such a way that the input prompt is moved to the start of the next data field when a specified command occurs which is assigned to a forward jump to a previous data field.” (refer to Col 7, Lines 20-45)

Hence, providing features disclosed by Ahern, would be desirable for a user to implement because Hals indicates there are numerous modification and change may be made to the system without departing from the teaching of Hals.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hals by including the features that prevent errors while display the information on the web page.

11. Referring to Claims 31 and 32, although Hals disclosed the invention substantially as claimed according to claim 22, Hals is silent regarding “wherein the independent program routine analyzes the position of a data pointing device assigned to the input medium, in particular a mouse pointer, and independently alters the display of an object contained in the active screen display in a predefined manner when the position of the data pointing device corresponds to a predefined position or a section in the active screen display.”

Ahern, in an analogous art disclosed, “wherein the independent program routine analyzes the position of a data pointing device assigned to the input medium, in particular a mouse pointer, and independently alters the display of an object contained in the active screen display in a predefined manner when the position of the data pointing device corresponds to a predefined position or a section in the active screen display.” (refer to Col 4, Lines 30-59)

Hence, providing features disclosed by Ahern, would be desirable for a user to implement because Hals indicates there are numerous modification and change may be made to the system without departing from the teaching of Hals.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hals by including the features that prevent errors while display the information on the web page.

12. Referring to Claim 33, although Hals disclosed the invention substantially as claimed according to claim 32, Hals is silent regarding “wherein the object is a button which changes the display types when the user clicks on it with the data pointing device.”

Ahern, in an analogous art disclosed, “wherein the object is a button which changes the display types when the user clicks on it with the data pointing device.” (refer to Col 4, Lines 60).

Hence, providing features disclosed by Ahern, would be desirable for a user to implement because Hals indicates there are numerous modification and change may be made to the system without departing from the teaching of Hals.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hals by including the features that prevent errors while display the information on the web page.

13. Referring to Claim 34, although Hals disclosed the invention substantially as claimed according to claim 32, Hals is silent regarding “wherein the object is a scroll bar and when clicked on by the user with the data pointing device, the display of the scroll bar is altered in a predefined manner and at least a part of the content of the active screen display is moved”.

Ahern, in an analogous art disclosed, “wherein the object is a scroll bar and when clicked on by the user with the data pointing device, the display of the scroll bar is altered in a predefined

Art Unit: 2151

manner and at least a part of the content of the active screen display is moved" (refer to Col 4, Lines 30-66).

Hence, providing features disclosed by Ahern, would be desirable for a user to implement because Hals indicates there are numerous modification and change may be made to the system without departing from the teaching of Hals.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hals by including the features that prevent errors while display the information on the web page.

14. Referring to Claim 35, although Hals disclosed the invention substantially as claimed according to claim 22, Hals is silent regarding "wherein the screen displays are transmitted at least in part in the form of bitmap files to the client computer".

Ahern, in an analogous art disclosed, "wherein the screen displays are transmitted at least in part in the form of bitmap files to the client computer" (refer to Col 4, Lines 30-66).

Hence, providing features disclosed by Ahern, would be desirable for a user to implement because Hals indicates there are numerous modification and change may be made to the system without departing from the teaching of Hals.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hals by including the features that prevent errors while display the information on the web page.

Claims 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hals et al hereinafter Hals (US 6,920,505) in view of Ahern (US 6,966,029) in further view of Hind et al hereinafter Hind (US 7,194,683) and Kramer (US 2002/0165993).

15. Referring to Claim 36, although Hals, Ahern, Hind and Kramer disclosed the invention substantially as claimed according to claim 22, Hals, Ahern, Hind and Kramer are silent regarding. “ wherein the transfer of the screen displays takes place in line with the RDP protocol.”

Kramer, in an analogous art disclosed, “ wherein the transfer of the screen displays takes place in line with the RDP protocol.” (Refer to 0061).

Hence, providing features disclosed by Kramer, would be desirable for a user to implement because Hals, Ahern, and Hind indicate there are numerous modification and change may be made to the system without departing from the teaching of Hals.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the systems of Hals, Ahern and Kramer by including the features that reduce the latency time and increase the response time.

16. Referring to Claims 38 and 39, although Hals, Ahern, and Hind disclosed the invention substantially as claimed according to claim 22, Hals, Ahern, and Hind are silent regarding “wherein the additional data packets are checked for redundant data, with any such redundant data then being removed or replaced by data already entered, before they are sent to the server computer.”

Kramer, in an analogous art disclosed, “wherein the additional data packets are checked for redundant data, with any such redundant data then being removed or replaced by data already entered, before they are sent to the server computer.” (Refer to 0061, and 0004, RDP has the property of encryption, which compressed the large data and sent it across the network.

Connection set up is according to connection parameter, since the connection is already established, the connection parameter must be used. When data are being compressed/encrypted, the system checks for redundant data and remove the unnecessary data.)

Hence, providing features disclosed by Kramer, would be desirable for a user to implement because Hals, Ahern, and Hind indicate there are numerous modification and change may be made to the system without departing from the teaching of Hals.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the systems of Hals, Ahern and Kramer by including the features that reduce the latency time and increase the response time.

17. Referring to Claims 40, 41, and 42, although Hals, Ahern, and Hind disclosed the invention substantially as claimed according to claim 22, Hals, Ahern, and Hind are silent regarding “wherein several of the data packets and/or additional data packets to be sent between the server computer and the client computer via the geostationary satellite are grouped together to form larger data packets and/or larger additional data packets”.

Kramer, in an analogous art disclosed, “wherein several of the data packets and/or additional data packets to be sent between the server computer and the client computer via the geostationary satellite are grouped together to form larger data packets and/or larger additional

data packets based on the connection-specific parameters ” (refer to 0061, and 0004, RDP has the property of encryption, which compressed the large data and sent it across the network.

Connection set up is according to connection parameter, since the connection is already established, the connection parameter must be used.).

Hence, providing features disclosed by Kramer, would be desirable for a user to implement because Hals, Ahern, and Hind indicate there are numerous modification and change may be made to the system without departing from the teaching of Hals.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the systems of Hals, Ahern and Kramer by including the features that reduce the latency time and increase the response time.

Conclusion

18. **Examiner's Notes:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the

Art Unit: 2151

specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

19. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen C. Tang whose telephone number is (571)272-3116. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7 - 3.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia Martin-Wallace can be reached on (571)272-3440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Karen Tang

V. Martin Wallace
SPE AU 2151